

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISTIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1/50 Alexandriz Virginia-22(1)-1450

APPLICAT	ION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/055	,865	01/23/2002	Hilarie Orman	112024-0086	5247	
21186	75	90 12/02/2005		EXAMINER		
SCH	WEGMA	N, LUNDBERG, W	LEE, PHILIP C			
1600	TCF TOW	'ER				
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MIN	MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402			2154		

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/055,865	ORMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Philip C. Lee	2154		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit							
	Philip C. Lee	2154							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 02 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
 ∴ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a)									
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). In the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).									
CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL									
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);									
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 									
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	• -	jected claims.							
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	illowable if submitted in a separate								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		rill be entered and an	explanation of						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ils to provide a 1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached paper.									
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)									
	5R								

Application/Control Number: 10/055,865

Art Unit: 2154

1. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but it is not persuasive because:

Page 2

Applicant argues that (1) Raman fails to teach wherein a structure includes an identification of an application layer protocol being used for communication by an application. In response to point (1), Raman taught a failover manager is able to maintain a stream state (i.e., data structure) based on monitoring the operation of the stream control protocol (col. 11, lines 21-24). Raman further taught the monitoring operation of the stream control protocol, which is used for the stream state (i.e., data structure), include monitoring the protocol actually used to transfer the stream data, such as RTP protocol (i.e., an example of a type of protocol). In such case, the packet of RTP can be monitored to obtain timing information (col. 11, lines 33-41). This means that after identifying the actual protocol (e.g., RTP or RTSP) used in the stream data, the stream state (i.e., data structure) must store identification (e.g. tag or indication) of the type of protocol in order to monitor messages with the identified protocol (e.g., RTP or RTSP).